

Boston March 9. 1838.

To the Editor of the
Worcester Palladium,



Dear Sir

18

I have just received a number

of your paper, in which I find myself announced as
the author of a Report, in the last Liberator, of the Pro-
ceedings of the late Clerical Convention, in Worcester,
& charged, as its author, with saying what is not true.
I presume your sense of justice will lead you
cheerfully to allow me to make the following state-
ments, in self defence.

1. You have no authority to publish me as the
author of said ^{report}, unless it be the authority of hearsay &
rumor. If such is your authority, you should have
said so, & not announced the matter, in the man-
ner you have. "Of this however, I care little," & say-
& merely notice it in passing, as I am perfectly ready,
not as reporter, but over my own signature, to stand
responsible for every thing to which you except. I
remark therefore,

2. That, neither "has the Rev. A. A. Phelps," nor the
reporter "taken the liberty to alter, add to, & take from
your report of the proceedings of the late Clerical Convention;
& thus garbled, to publish it in the 'Boston Liberator'." The reporter
made out his own report, from his own notes. In doing so,

his object was, ~~not to report in detail, all that was said &~~
~~done on the occasion, for that were impossible, but first, to give~~
~~a general & correct outline thereof, & second, to put on re-~~
~~cord ^{various} ~~the~~ facts & remarks ^{showing} ~~which showed~~ that the~~
~~Remonstrants, ~~had~~ at the different sessions of the Con-~~
~~vention,~~

his object was, not to report in detail every particular thing that was said & done on the occasion, for that were impossible, but to give a general & correct outline thereof, & at the same time, put on record various facts & remarks indicative of the inconsistency of the minority, at the two different sessions of the Convention. "That the reporter might ~~not be charged with unfairness~~ ^{temporary Editor of the Liberator} ~~that he might not be charged~~ ^{the} informs his readers, ^{expressly,} as you have not informed yours, that "those passages, which most deeply implicate the minority, have been taken, for the most part, verbatim, from a report of the proceedings, published some weeks since, in the Worcester Palladium, a paper that is now lending its influence wholly to the minority. Those passages are indicated by quotation

marks & many of them are italicized". Your readers will see therefore, that the reporter, in quoting from your report, did not "take the liberty to alter, add to, & take from it, & thus garbled to publish it &c. He wrote his own report; & because you were friendly to the course of the minority, that he might avoid the charge of "unfairness" to them, he simply, on points that implicated them, quoted from you, taking care however to give you credit for the passages quoted. ~~If in any case the~~

Jan. 25, 1838.

As the author of ~~the~~ report, in
the Proceedings of the late Clerical Convention in Worcester,
& charged, as its author, with saying in it, what is not
true. Will you allow me then, in justice, to make
the following statements.

1. You have no authority or right to publish me
as the author of said report, in the manner you have
done. I am not announced ^{officially} as its author in the Libera-
tor, or in any other way. If rumor ^{or} hearsay have
so announced me, you were at liberty to say so.

And not being aware, that by copy-right or in any other way, your report was tabooed even to quotation, he was not aware of anything irreverent or improper in venturing, for the sake of fairness to the implicated, to quote therefrom. If, in this matter, he has erred, ^{reporter} I have no doubt, that on proof thereof, the will make the amende honorable.

3. The reporter does not "go on to connect Mr. Miller with the Palladium as responsible for certain articles you have published relating to the Convention". All that the reporter says is - "Mr. Miller said, the minority were not only prepared to present such remonstrance, but to follow it up in the papers". The editor for. tem. of the Liberator, commenting briefly on the report, & adverting to this remark, said also - "and somebody makes good the significant flowing threat, 'to follow it up in the papers'". And this is all that any one says, in the Liberator, on the point. ^{that neither} ~~Neither~~ does Mr. Phelps, nor the reporter, nor the editor, whether these be one individual or three, nor does any one else "go on to connect Mr. Miller" in the manner stated. All that is said by any one is, that Mr. Miller made such a threat, & then that "somebody" ~~had~~ made it good, not in the Palladium merely, but "in the papers". The

4. If, in any case, the customary marks of quotation are omitted, it is not, intentially, the fault of the reporter or any one else.

(8.)

Friday a.m. Jan 2^d 38.

Francis Jackson president in the
Chair. Prayer by P. L. Gould.

Mr. Hanson from Africa made a
Statement &c. C. P. Grosvenor, ~~also~~
O. Johnson.

The following Resolution was submitted
by Mr. Johnson for discussion "That the
doctrines & measures of the Abolitionists
are in perfect accordance with the
Constitution of the U. S. & the Bible".

A Mr. Hogan, from the South. Mr. Cole,
& Prof: Cole, Grosvenor, Phelps.

Laid upon the table marked H

~~Moved that when we adjourn~~

Mr. Garrison then submitted a ^{further} portion
of the Annual Report.

On motion, laid on the table to be taken
up at nine o'clock to-morrow morning.

Palladium is by no means the only paper in which the remonstrance has been followed up. If therefore Mr. M. "is in no manner responsible for any article that has ever appeared in its columns", it does not follow that he is alike free from responsibility in respect to "~~the papers~~" "the papers". Be the responsibility however whose it may, no man can question the fact that "somebody has made good the significant threat"; & this is all, that ~~any~~ ^{was} ~~one~~ in the Liberator, has ever said, in the Liberator. But,

4. This threat it seems was never uttered! "In justice to that gentleman, (Mr. Miller), ~~you~~ ^{you} state, that no such language was used by him in the Convention"; & in saying so, the reporter has "put language into the mouth of one member, at least, which was never uttered by him". This certainly is very positive, & for one, I would not venture to contradict it on slight grounds. ~~If I had no evidence but that of memo-ry in the case, though I might be quite sure, I should yet choose to admit~~ As it is however, I am willing, not as reporter, but over my own name, to assume the responsibility of ~~the matter~~ saying, that Mr. Miller did utter that "language", in the Convention. ~~You report that to do with the forward~~ This I would not say, in the face of your denial, had I no evidence in the case but memo-ry. ^{but} I should choose rather to believe ~~you~~ ^{in the} right. But as it is, I am sure that you are wrong. Your report had

Conventions.

	Whole No	Minut	Ratio	St. Paid	St. P
Nat. A. S. Convent	62	11		4 Dec	
Delegates					
Vice Pres					

to do with the proceedings of the first meeting of the Convention. The remark in question was made at the close of the second meeting, & not of the first, in the confusion & warmth created by the motion of Mr. Barbour to "take the main question now," immediately after Mr. Woodbridge's remarks in opposition to that motion, & when there was so much of the warmth if not of "the spirit of the forum" prevalent, that no one would be likely to remember what passed, unless he chanced to take it down on paper at the time. This I did. I was seated not six feet from Mr. M., taking notes of what passed. The remark, ~~as it fell from his lips~~, struck me at the time, as ominous of the future, & I took it down verbatim, as it fell from his lips, & it now stands in my notes thus: — "I follow it up in the papers." ~~The remark, it is true, might have been made from the impulse of the moment, & Mr. Miller, forgotten it, you may have forgotten it or in the excitement of the moment.~~ ~~It might not have struck your mind with it.~~ ~~Now Mr. M. might not have meant, in making it, all that the remark implies, & on these accounts he may have forgotten it. For these same, or similar reasons, if you noticed it at the time, you may have forgotten it.~~ ~~Indeed it is quite possible, considering the excitement of the moment, that I should have done so, but for the record, in so many words, put on paper at the time. As it is then, I feel warranted in saying, & think I cannot be mistaken in it, even now,~~ that Mr. Miller did utter the remark in

question, & that "somebody" ~~(I do not say that anybody)~~
 has in point of fact, "followed it up in the papers." ~~It is~~
~~hardly possible to be sure that the remark~~ If it can be shown
 however ~~that I am in error in this, I will most cheerfully~~
 retract, & see that ~~all~~ proper ~~correction~~ ~~is made in~~
 the Liberator.

Yours respectfully

A. A. Phelps.

Communication to the

Prosester Palladium

March 9. 1838.

Refused & printed in the Spy.